IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE MIDDLE DISTRICT OF ALABAMA

Tony Fountain #152157 Civil Action No. 2:06-CV-

DR. peasant, et, al, Defendants.

MOTION OF OPPOSITION TO THE JUDGE

ORDER OF MAY 29 2007 DENYING PLAINTIFF

MOTION TO VOID MAGISTRATE JUDGE ORDER

OF AUGUST 2 2006 AND IN APPOSITION TO THE

CLARIFICATION OF ENFORCEMENT OF THE MAGISTRATE

JUDGE ORDER OF AUGUST 2 2006.

COMES NOW, TONY FOUNTAIN, by and through himself hereby "Objects" to the Judge order of May 29 2007. Chuying his Motion to Void the Magistrate Judge (Susan Russ walker) order of August 2 2006. And opposed the Judge Clarification of Enforcement of the Magistrate Judge order of August 2 2006. Plaintiff's asserts the following facts in Support of Whis Motion to Wit:

1). Plain tiff Contends, the united States
District Judge Should decide any and
all dispositive Matter, see U.S. V. RaddATZ
1147 U.S 667, 65 L.Ed. 424, 100 Sitt 2406

And the facts that Judge MyRon H. Thompson order of May 29 2004, is Misplaced on the point that 28 h.s.c. § 636 &- b anthorizes the Magistrate Judge (Shsan Russ walker) to decide a dispositive Motion to proceed in forma payeris Status without First allowing a district Court Judge Review and adoption of the Magistrate Judge order or the Consent of the parties. Tripati v. Rison, 847 F.2d. 548 (94m cir. 1988), also see 28 U.S. C. § 636 (C) (1), Ambrose V. Welch 729 F.2d. 1084 (4m cir. 1984), Geancy V. Carlson, 776 F.2d. 140 25 142 (74m cir. 1985).

2). A void order or Judgment deprives, I court of Juris diction to Jet, Klugh V. U. S. D.C. S.C., 620

First F. Supp. 892 It 901, in which I court deling without Jurisdiction, orders, Judgments ect--- is I nullity. Therefore, plaintiff was not required to object to the Magistrate Judge order of August 2206 within the ten days time period. And plaintiff Content had he been Notified of his Rights of Consenting to I Magistrate Judge (Susan Russ walker), being appointed to Consider his motion to proceed in format plupperis Status, pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636 (C)(1). Only than would he would have been Required to

Object within ten (10) days to the Magistrate Judge Report or Recommendation. 28 m. s. C. & 636 (D)(1)(C). Which was Substantiated by Rule 72(B), F.R.Civ. p. Plaintiff, further Contends a magistrate Judge (Susan Russ wallker) had no authority to issue a dispositive Order, derying or Granting in forms pauperis Status absent the district Court Judge's Review and adoption of the Magistrate Judge order or the Consent of the Parties. Tripati, Suprais See also Minetti v. port of Seattle 152 F. 3d. 1113 at 1114 (942 cir. 1998), Neither Of the Ifore said Steps was taken by this Court on the Judge (Magistrate) order of August 2 2006.

3). Plaintiff Stresses the facts, that 28 h.s.C. & 636(6X1)

(C) provides parties with a ten day period,
during which to object to a proposed findings and
Recommendations of a magistrate judge (Susan Russ
walker). However a magistrate judge is only required
to make proposed finding and recommendations to the
district (ourt with respects
to motions specified in
28 h.s.C. & 636(6)(1)(A). See 28 h.s.C. & 636(6)(1)(B). Section
636(6)(1)(A) Contains no reference to an application to
proceed in forma papperis Rather the masistrate Judge
(Susan Russ walker) authority to make Rulings or Recommendation on a dispositive pretrial matters not

Specified in 28 u.s.c. & 636 (b)(1)(A) is derived from 28 u.s.c. & 636 (b)(3), which does not requires a Magistrate Judge to Submit proposed findings and Recommendations. Section 28 u.s. C. \$636 (b)(3) does not provide a party with tendays to file a written objections with the Court. See Minetti V. port of Seattle 152 F.3d. 1113 at 1114 (9th cir. 1998). Plaintiff, Maintain and Contends, the Magistrate Judge (5,542 Russ walker) was without authority to decide

Plaintiff, Maintain and Contends, the Magistrate Judge (Susan Russ walker) was without authority to decide a dispositive matter such as his Modion to proceed in Forma pauperis Status. In which she Cranted on August 2 2006 and ender plaintiff to pay the Sum of \$350.00 on or before August 10 2006 or his action would be dismissed. Absent the district Court Judge Review and adoption of the Magistrate order of August 2 2006 or the Consent of the Partys. Ambrose V. welch 729 F.21. 1084 (640 Cir. 1584).

4). Further more, plaintiff Contends the judge order of May 29 2007 (larifying the Enforcement of the Magistrate Judge (Susan Russ walker) order of August 2 2006, were misplaced. Rule 72 (a) F.R.Civ.P. only Refered to nondispositive matter, an application to proceed in Brand Pauperis status is not a nondispositive Matter under 72 (d) F.R.Civ.P. See Minetti V. port of Seattle Supra.

plaintiff Contends, the Magistrate Judge (Susan Russ walker failed to Comply with Rule 72 (b). F.R. Cip this Court have power to Review and/or reconsider dry pretrial matter pursuant to 28 h.S.C. & 636 (b) (D)(A) where its has been shown that the Magistrate order is Clearly erroneous or Contrary to law as set forth above. By ordering reimbursing plaintiff & 350.00 Filing fee's that the Magistrate had no power or authority to order with out the district Judge Review of her order of August 2 2006, or Consent OF the partys which neither steps were taken in this Case pending before this Court. Tripati v. Rison Supra.

Wherefore plaintiff prays that (2) his Objection be sustain as the law and Juthority herein Requires.

Done this 4th day of June 2007.

Hory Fount I.W. M

pro

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICES

I hereby, Certify that I have served a true and Correct Copy of the Foregoing as addressed:

OFFice of the Altorney General 11th South union Street, Monte, Al. 36130

-6

The law Office of porterfield, Harper, Mills & Motlow p.C. 22 In verness center parkway suite 600 p.o. Box 530 790, Birinsham, Al. 35253-2790

by placing the stree in the U.S. Mail on this 4th day of June 200%.

